

WHY DONA GILMAN SLAIN BY A MEMBER OF HER OWN FAMILY?

FEATURES OF THE MURDER MYSTERY.

Dona Gilman, aged twenty, found strangled to death in vacant lot near her home in Dayton, Ohio, last November.

Left letters to her sweetheart, showing she was uneasy over his safety.

Several arrests followed finding of body, one being that of a burglar.

"Baby" Dave, an eccentric "tin-badge" detective, "confessed" to crime, giving closest details, later found to be correct, but was discharged by the police "because he was such a liar."

Mother of murdered girl arrested, charged by Detective Heffner with being the criminal; Fayne Gilman, Dona's sister, and Collins Gilman, her brother, arrested, charged with being accessories.

Mrs. Gilman had a "vision," wherein she saw a strange man strangle Dona.

Grand jury has perplexing case to settle.

NO murder in a long time has had more mysterious, perplexing and pathetic features than that of Dona Gilman, which the authorities of Dayton, Ohio, are trying hard to solve.

The question which may soon have to be decided by the Ohio grand jury, is whether Miss Gilman, who was a beautiful young girl of twenty, was killed by her mother, aided and abetted by her son and daughter. There are cases in which many motives for the crime can be brought forth. No reason is known why Mrs. Leah C. Gilman and her two children, Fayne, an elder sister of Dona, and Collins, the son, should have murdered Dona Gilman. But affidavits have been sworn to by Constable Heffner charging the mother with the murder of the daughter. All three were arrested. Mrs. Gilman being charged with the murder and Collins and Fayne with being accessories.

The preliminary hearing before Magistrate Wagner resulted in the mother and son being bound over to the grand jury and the discharge of Fayne. Subsequently mother and son were given freedom under bonds of \$5,000 each.

In case Dona Gilman was killed by members of her own family, was it due to a sudden fit of passion over some trifling affair? Were the love affairs of the young woman responsible for her death? Was it over money matters? Are some of the members of the family mentally irresponsible for their actions? Will insanity play an important part in this investigation as it has in so many others in recent years? If the grand jury, which is now investigating the case, holds Mrs. Gilman and her son and daughter, Collins and Fayne, for trial, these questions will be answered.

Body Found in Lot.

Dona Gilman, young and pretty, was killed on the night of Tuesday, November 20. Her body was discovered by her brother, Collins, on Thursday morning within less than a hundred feet of the Gilman home. Was the body lying on this vacant lot during this entire time, or was it carried there some time after the murder? That is the question upon whose answer the grand jury will largely base its decision. A hundred or more witnesses will be called upon to state what they know of the affair, about which there is so much mystery.

About 5 o'clock on Tuesday evening Dona Gilman left the bindery department of the National Cash Register Works, where she was employed. Her sister, Fayne, usually accompanied her home, but on this evening she remained to help take care of one of the women who had been hurt. Bright and cheerful, Dona boarded a street car with a crowd of her young friends and went with them to the point where she transferred for her home on Arlington Heights. She got on another car and reached a point within a short distance of her home. At first it was believed that she was murdered while going over this dark stretch of road.

Only the night before she had written a letter to her sweetheart, a young fellow by the name of Stanley Anderson, who lived at Sharon, Ohio, and who had been to Dayton to see her on Sunday evening.

"I hated to see you go down that ugly dark walk last night, but I couldn't help it. I hope you didn't have to walk to the car."

In another part of the same letter

she says: "Now, if you go hunting be careful not to shoot yourself. I hope you landed in Sharon all O. K."

Strangled By a Fiend.

In less than twenty-four hours after penning these words she herself was cold in death, the life strangled out of her body by the remorseless clutch of some human fiend. If that fiend was a member of her own family, her brother or her mother, so much the more terrible and gruesome does the death scene become. Robert Keyes, a neighbor, says that he and his wife heard a struggle in the Gilman house on the evening when the girl was killed. In the affidavit filed by Detective Heffner, Mrs. Gilman is accused of being the principal in the affair, and Fayne and Collins Gilman are accused of having aided her.

This is one of the strangest murder cases that have ever baffled police and detectives. For three weeks after the discovery of the dead body on the vacant lot right by the side of the Gilman home, no clue could be found, which pointed to a guilty party. Many suspects in various places were held and examined, but they were allowed to go as soon as it was found that no actual charge could be made against them.

Several self-confessed murderers

Dave is a "tin badge" detective; and so when the Gilman murder was announced to him, he said that he would find out the villain.

Dave heard so much about the details of the murder that he finally imagined he had committed the crime. On the 7th of December he went to the police station and gave himself up as the guilty party. He went with the detectives to the supposed scene of the murder and in pantomime showed exactly how he had assaulted and strangled to death his innocent and fair young victim. Later in the day Dave denied that he had done the killing.

The confession gained from "Baby Dave" was of considerable length, and in it he accounts for his movements in detail on the night of the crime, ending with a description of the methods he had employed in murdering the girl.

He claimed in the confession to have eaten in a restaurant at about 5:30 on Tuesday evening, and left on a Fifth street car for the Soldiers' Home, where he had to deliver some circulars and almanacs. The ill-fated Dona Gilman was on the same car, and together they rode out to Groveland avenue. Dave stated that he was struck with the girl's great beauty, and when she alighted he asked her if he might accompany her home. She



THE GILMAN HOME.

have appeared. One of these was a burglar who broke into a house one night. On being questioned, however, it appeared that he was half-witted and that he had had nothing to do with the affair.

"Baby Dave's" Confession.

The other man who claimed that he murdered Dona Gilman was "Baby Dave" Curtis, an eccentric newspaper vender.

The confession was made at about 4 o'clock in the morning, and as soon as day had broken he was taken in a cab to the scene. Here he went over the ground carefully, and it was his accurate description of the surroundings on the night of the crime that strengthened belief in his guilt. Dave, it is claimed by the officers, told where lights were burning in the houses along the street, and asserted that he had seen a woman with a baby in her arms standing in a window in a certain house. Investigation later substantiated all these facts, it is claimed, and the authorities were positive they had the right man.

Later he denied the whole story, saying he had been frightened into it by the detectives' threats. Then he was released, the police explaining that he was "such a liar."

Hands in the Dark.

Mrs. Gilman, since her arrest, claims to have had a vision, wherein she saw a strange man murder her daughter outside her own window. This is a fragment of her hysterical assertion: "The monster who was after Dona was running on his toes now. His sleeves were rolled up and his felt hat pulled over his eyes. Dona was humming and did not hear the footsteps. As she entered the square of grass, lighted from the window, she stopped and looked behind."

"Two great hands reached out of the dark and strangled my poor little daughter so that her feet seemed scarcely to touch the ground as she struggled to get breath to cry for help that was so near."

"The monster himself stood outside the light, but I remember the white gleam of his eye as he stood silently waiting for her struggles to end. At last she hung limp and quiet. Then the black figure carried her off through the bushes of the common."

"I awoke in such a condition that it was a long time before I could control myself."

Quarrels in the Family.

It is said that there were frequent quarrels in the Gilman family. A chum of Dona who works at the National Cash Register works says that Dona had complained to her of the cruelty of her mother. Dona had said to her on the day of the murder: "I am afraid to go home tonight because I told my mother this morning that I must have a new dress. She tried to lock me in a closet, but I got away. Just as I left the house she said, 'All right, my girl, I'll get you



DONA GILMAN THE MURDERED GIRL.

this evening when you come home."

Mrs. Gilman is alleged to have become angry on one occasion with a rent collector, and to have thrown him on the sofa by grabbing him by the throat. Mr. Keyes, the neighbor, who says he heard a struggle on Tuesday, wanted to go over to see what was the matter, but his wife was afraid to be left alone with the baby, and said that it was one of the frequent family quarrels. Another neighbor said that the little sister, Bessie, had one time come running over to her house with her hand out. The little girl said that her sister, Fayne, had cut her with a butcher knife, and that she was afraid to go home again. No investigation of these family tiffs is known to have been made, but it is claimed that the authorities were asked to investigate. It is asserted that a girl friend called to see Dona one evening and found her peering in the cellar, the rest of the family having gone out.

Queer Threats Alleged.

According to a Mrs. Somers, who was in the Gilman house when the body was carried in by Collins and Fayne from the adjoining lot, Bessie, the younger sister, said to her mother on seeing the body:

"You are to blame for this. You have often wished that this would happen." Fayne then rushed to the side of her smaller sister and placed her hand over her mouth, saying: "Shut up or I'll kill you."

At the time of the murder, it was claimed that Mrs. Gilman would hardly survive the shock more than a few days. She was suffering from dropsy and from heart trouble, the physician said. A week later she was removed to the Miami Valley Hospital, and the home was broken up. On December 16, two doctors pronounced the illness of Mrs. Gilman a sham; and she was at once removed to the jail. In spite of her pretended bodily suffering she is said to have stood the rough ride without complaint.

Where was the body of Dona Gilman from Tuesday night to Thursday morning? Her brother Collins says that she slept on a sofa down stairs Tuesday night, so that he could wait on his mother if she needed any attention. When Dona did not appear on the following morning, the family thought that she had probably eloped. Mrs. Gilman is said to have telephoned to young Anderson to find out if he and Dona had made off together. Mrs. Gilman claims that she told Collins to go out and search for the

body of his sister, for she feared that possibly she had met with foul play. Collins seems to have clung tenaciously to the elopement idea, for he did not make any very careful search.

"It was not my first wife," he said, "that led me finally to the spot where Dona's body was lying. I went there in accordance with the wish of my mother, who must have had a prophetic belief that my sister's body was lying in the weeds. I know of no one who would deliberately plot to take her life. She had no enemies as far as I know."

No "Dense Weeds."

A number of people who had gone across the vacant lot on which the body was found claim that they would surely have seen it had it been there on Wednesday. It looks, therefore, as if the body must have been brought there some time that night. It was reported at first that the body was concealed by dense weeds, but later it was found that the only undergrowth was dry timothy. The dead body could have been plainly seen from the upper window of the Gilman house, and Mrs. Gilman herself says that she saw Collins pick up his sister. Fayne then ran out and helped him to carry it into the house. Only a few people saw them carrying their ghastly burden; but more soon began to arrive.

According to Detective Heitzman, a colored washerwoman, who was at work in the Gilman home on Thursday morning, said that when Collins came back to the house and told his mother that he had not found his sister, the mother commanded him to look right below the tree in the commons, and that if he would not go and bring the body, she herself would go and get the remains if she had to crawl there on all fours. Then when the people began to come in Mrs. Gilman and Fayne, it is said, thanked the old colored woman for what she had done in helping them to find Dona.

Fayne Gilman knew that her beautiful younger sister started for home at 5 o'clock Tuesday evening. She knew that her sister had a dark lot to cross before she reached her home. When she arrived and found that Dona was not there, the natural thing to have done would have been to start a search of the neighborhood for fear that some villain had attacked her. There is a colored settlement, known as Tin Town, not far away, and they might have suspected that Dona had been waylaid by a negro assailant.

Went to Work as Usual.

Instead of this, Collins and Fayne went to work the next day as usual and reported the disappearance of their sister, saying that they thought she must have eloped. If the body of the dead girl had been lying on the spot where it was later found within 100 feet of the house and not more than 20 feet from the sidewalk, it would surely have been found if any sort of a search had been made. Why was the family so slow in calling in outside aid in helping them to locate the missing girl? It is said that they wished to avoid the notoriety which is always attached to such affairs. But a little notoriety would usually be preferred to a lost or brutally assaulted sister.

People in a civilized country shrink from the thought that a mother, assisted by two of her children, would have deliberately and without any apparent cause put to death a third child. Dona was a beautiful girl, and she is also said to have been of a lovable disposition. One of the girls employed at the factory where the two sisters worked said that Fayne was devoted to her sister, and that she looked after her like a mother.

"Fayne is one of the most worthy girls I ever knew," continued Miss Johnson. "She has a good mind, refined tastes and sensibilities, and it is incomprehensible to me that she could know a thing about the crime." And yet Fayne Gilman has been accused in an affidavit of being an accessory in the murder of her sister. Whether she is guilty or not is yet to be decided.

Alcohol No Inspiration To Poets Say Poets

THE Literary Echo, a newspaper, of Berlin, recently printed a symposium signed by many of the most eminent writers of poetry and prose in Germany on the question as to whether or not alcohol is an inspiration to creative literary and poetical work. Some of the opinions are given as follows:

Karl Henckell: I dare say a good cognac has occasionally delivered me from an attack of stomachache, but it has never yet carried my lyric balloon into more rarified air. For habitual drunkards, total abstinence seems the only cure, no matter whether the tipple is a grog or a port.

A. Schmittmeyer: Whenever I have occasionally been induced to take alcohol during the day, the result has been that both the wish and ability to work have invariably vanished. I take no stimulants apart from a bottle of light beer just before going to bed.

Detlef von Liliencron: I never take alcohol before or during work. I have observed that it interferes with my working powers.

Fritz Lienhard: I take next to no alcohol. I have no need and no desire for it.

George Reicher: Alcohol may occasionally inspire this or that idea, but real work is only hindered by it.

I would not do away entirely with alcoholic drinks, but the greatest moderation should be practiced.

F. Avenarius: Since I began serious work I have never taken alcohol either before or while I am at work. It does not inspire the imagination and it does paralyze the intellectual faculty. Judging by personal experience, abstemiousness, alcohol is the greatest stuper in existence.

Dr. Karl Busse: I own with satisfaction that mine is a good German throat, which I take care to moisten every evening. I object to temperance principles, because they seem to me to go hand in hand with a certain lack of temperament. It is nonsense to try to force a man physically and morally sound to adopt methods only required for invalids and those morally weak.

Otto Julius Bierbaum: I have nothing to say against people raising their spirits by the consumption of a moderate quantity of alcohol. Should do it myself if the consequences were not fatal to me. Unfortunately, alcohol-begotten hilarity does not make my heart merry, but heavy, and has the exactly opposite effect of causing exhalation in rarefied mountain air, or the sight of a thing of beauty, or the sound of good music, or the fragrance of certain odors. The smallest quantity of alcohol absolutely paralyzes me. It stupifies my brain.

man of moderate means can only enjoy in brief seasons or at long intervals. It may be doubted, however, whether the very rich man gets any more pleasure from his palate and his organs of smell in the course of the year than the man who is compelled to follow the changes of the season in the selection of his foods and drinks.

There are, however, luxuries of a rarer sort which the very rich man can secure for himself and his family, while the poor man, or the man of moderate means, cannot procure them at all. Such a luxury is the ownership of beautiful, artistic objects—of

fine pictures, etchings, statuary, or beautiful examples of ceramic art. In the care of health—their own and those they love—the very rich people have certain indisputable advantages, although they also suffer from peculiar exposure to the diseases consequent on luxury and ennui.

The keen pursuit of wealth is often exciting and exacting; to keep and defend great wealth and sometimes an anxious business; and if great riches bring with them a habit of self-indulgence and of luxurious living in general, it is well-nigh certain that the self-indulgent and luxurious person will suffer bodily evils which his plain living neighbor will escape.

Some of the Advantages and Disadvantages of Great Riches

Since the Civil War a New Kind of Rich Man Has Appeared in the United States.

[Extract from "Great Riches," by Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University. Published by Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.]

SINCE the Civil War a new kind of rich man has come into existence in the United States. He is very much richer than anybody ever was before, and his riches are, in the main, of a new kind. They are not great areas of land, or numerous palaces, or flocks and herds, or thousands of slaves, or masses of chattels. They are in part city rents, but chiefly stocks and bonds of corporations and bonds of States, counties, cities, and towns. These riches carry with them of necessity no visible or tangible responsibility, and bring upon their possessor no public or semi-public functions.

The rich men are neither soldiers or sailors; they are not magistrates, or legislators, or church dignitaries. They are not great lords in the old sense, and they never lead their tenants into battle as did the feudal chiefs. They have no public functions of an importance commensurate with their riches. Such occupations as they have, in addition to the

making of more money, they have to invent themselves. The public admires and envies them, and sees that they are often serviceable, but also criticizes and blames them, and to some extent fears them. It is disposed to think them dangerous to the republic and a blot on democratic society; but at the same time is curious about their doings and their mode of life, and is in rather a puzzle about their moral quality. I propose to consider briefly some of the advantages and disadvantages which, great modern riches bring the owner and the community.

Adequate warmth and light, appropriate clothing, good bedding, good plumbing, and nice chairs, tables and household fittings sufficient to insure bodily comfort, are easily within the reach of all well-to-do persons; and great riches can do no more for their possessor in the way of comfort. The least physical ailment, like a gouty toe, or a dull ear, or a decayed tooth, will subtract more from comfort than all the riches in the world can add. With pleasure it is different. Some real pleasures are very expensive, and

only great riches can procure them. For instance, the unobstructed and impregnable possession of a fine natural landscape is a great pleasure which the very rich man can secure for himself by his private means; whereas, the poor man, or the man of moderate means, can enjoy such



CHARLES W. ELIOT, President of Harvard University.

a privilege only by availing himself of great public domains, or of unoccupied regions; and there his own privilege will not be secure, or transmissible to descendants. The very rich man can provide himself with music and the drama without regard to their cost; but it by no means requires very great riches to procure a quite adequate amount of these pleasures.

Such pleasures as involve the purchase and maintenance of very costly machines like yachts, or large automobiles, or of great stables filled with fine horses and carriages, or of large greenhouses and gardens may be enjoyed in their extremes only by the very rich; but then on a smaller scale, similar pleasures may be enjoyed equally by persons who are only moderately well-off, and often the larger scale does not add to the pleasure. The young lawyer who is fond of riding may easily get more pleasure out of his single saddle horse, kept at a club stable, than the multi-millionaire gets from his forty horses and twenty different carriages.

One advantage the very rich man un-

doubtedly has. Many so-called pleasures pall after a little while. The possessor of numerous horses and carriages, for example, finds that he has no pleasure in driving or riding. He is tired of it all. Or, to his surprise he finds his yacht a bore, and, on the whole, a plague. Then he can cast aside the pleasure, which is no longer a pleasure, and take up with some new fad or fever.

The public does not grudge their pleasures to the very rich, providing they can be pursued without harming others. Indeed the public approves all many, outdoor, risky sports of the rich, if not inconsiderately pursued, and rather prefers the very rich man who is extravagant in these ways to one who has no interest in sports.

When it comes to what are called luxuries the very rich have undoubtedly the advantage over other people. Thus, the very rich can procure for themselves all sorts of rare and delicious foods and drinks. They can have fruits and vegetables out of season, and fish and game brought from afar.

These pleasures of the palate the